REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration is requested.

By this response, new claims 21-23 have been added. Thus, claims 1-23 remain pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 10-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Laursen, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,120), hereinafter *Laursen*, in view of HP Jetsend Technology Making Device-To-Device Communication Simple (hereinafter Jetsend): http://web.archive.org/web/19980124223300/www.jetsend.com/Backgrnder.html (p.1-6, 1/24/98), further in view of *Wu, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,711), hereinafter *Wu.*

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that Laursen fails to teach or suggest a web server having a forms printing solution for supporting version controlled forms generation and transmission via an information exchange protocol and a control interface for generating and transmitting forms as electronic material. The Examiner, however, asserts that Jetsend and Wu teach such deficiencies of Laursen. The Examiner asserts that Wu teaches "the creating, displaying(rendering), transferring, of a form(s), which are controlled by a form version – VitaScript."

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner further asserts that "it would have been obvious ... to combine the teachings of Laursen, and Wu because ...Wu teaches the quick transmission of compact form data to various clients on a network, *thereby providing the advantage of quickly transmitting the forms across the network.*" The Examiner's assertions are respectfully traversed as Wu fails to teach or suggest transmitting the forms across the network.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a web server having a forms printing solution for supporting version controlled forms generation and transmission via an information exchange protocol and a control interface for generating and transmitting forms as electronic material. Wu fails to teach or suggest such a claim feature.

Wu discloses a scripting language for distributed database programming. In Wu, once a user is logged in during a user request operation, the user specifies a form to be used through the client applet on client computer 1004. The user inputs data into the form and the data is transmitted by a session manager 1010 to database 1018. The user will then submit the request to another user in the network. Depending on the network environment to implement the Vitascript system, the second user will be alerted to the presence of a request. Upon receiving the request, the second user logs into the system, and pulls the data comprising the request from the database 1018. See Wu's col. 14, lines 35-50.

Wu fails to teach or suggest creating, displaying(rendering), transferring, of form(s). As demonstrated above, a user logs into the system and enters the data which is stored in the database. A second user also logs into the system and retrieves the data stored in the database to populate the form. The form is not transmitted as asserted by the Examiner. A document having data for populating a form is retrieved by various users. Wu's col. 15, line 10 to col. 16, line 30 further emphasizes such concept.

Since Wu merely requires populating a form from the data that is stored in the database, it teaches away from transmitting forms as electronic material as recited in claim 1.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143 - § 2143.03 for decisions pertinent to each of these criteria.

In view of the above, the combination of Laursen, Jetsend and Wu, fails to teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1. Moreover, Wu teaches away from claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinct over the prior art of record. Withdrawal of rejection of claim 1 is respectfully urged.

As claims 2-10 depend from claim 1, they limit the scope of claim 1 in a patentable sense. Accordingly, claims 2-10 are also allowable for reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 in addition to their own respective features.

For example, claim 7 further recites the web server comprises a Java vending machine, the Java vending machine operative to pull a user selected Jetsend job from a server file system and transmit the Jetsend job to a user selected output device.

The Examiner acknowledges that Laursen fails to disclose a Java vending machine operative to pull a user selected job. The Examiner, however, asserts that Covert cures Laursen's deficiency and teaches the obtaining, and controlling of a print job by a Java applet. The Examiner further asserts that it would have been obvious to combine Covert with Laursen, Jetsend, and Wu because Covert teaches a form displaying method for conveniently displaying one question or statement at a time on a PDA. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Covert's col. 14, lines 12-67 merely discloses that JAVA applet processes digital signature to authenticate it and if it is an acceptable signature authorizes operation of a banking machine. A JAVA applet or script may be written to perform a multitude number of functions. Covert's JAVA applet is programmed to authenticate signatures and authorize an operation. Covert fails to teach or suggest a Java vending machine operative to pull a user selected Jetsend job from a server file system and transmit the Jetsend job to a user selected Jetsend output device.

Accordingly, even if Covert is combined with other references of record, all the elements of claim 7 are not met. Claim 7 is patentably distinct over the prior art of record for the above-noted reasons.

Claim 8 which depends from claim 7 is further patentably distinct over the prior art references of record. The Examiner acknowledges that Laursen fails to disclose the web server further comprises an HTML interface operative to generate and store a cookie on the web browser of the client machine, the cookie containing specific information detailing a user selected form to be printed and a network address for the output device selected to generate the form. The Examiner, however, asserts that Laor teaches "the

storage of a cookie in a client's computer for customizing user's document requests (col. 1, lines 27-67)." The Examiner further asserts that "it would have been obvious ...to have combined the teachings of Laursen, Jetsend, Covert, and Laor because Laor teaches the customization of user's requests to align with user's preferences." Applicants disagree.

Laor discloses that a cookie is provided to the client for the purpose of "recognizing the client and/or providing some pre-determined and pre-programmed level of customization at the discretion of the information provider." Thus, Laor's customization is performed at the discretion of the information provider and not at the discretion of a user and to a user selected Jetsend output device as recited in claim 7. Laor teaches away from claim 8.

Accordingly, even if Laor is combined with other references of record, all the limitations of claim 8 are not met. Withdrawal of rejection of claim 8 is requested.

Applicants' arguments made with reference to claim 1 are applicable to claims 11 and 18. Accordingly, claims 11 and 18 are believed to be in condition for allowance for the own respective features in addition to the arguments set forth with reference to claim 1.

As claims 12-17 depend from claim 11, they too are in condition for allowance. As claims 19-20 depend from claim 18, they too are allowable.

In this response, new claims 21-23 are added. Such claims find support at least page 11, lines 15-20 of the present specification as originally filed. No new matter is introduced.

New claims 21-23 individually recite, in part, wherein respective ones of the user-perceptible forms rendered by the output device have content and spacing corresponding with a state of the respective ones of the user-perceptible forms when resident within the web server. In addition to the distinctions noted above with reference to claim 1, none of the references of record teach or suggest the above recited claim feature. Claims 21-23 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview before issuance of any such subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary R. Ackaret, Inventor

Date: 12/10/03 By: _____

Keith D. Grzelak
Reg. No. 37,144

December 10, 2003
(509) 624-4276